



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

DAS DEUTERONOMIUM. Übersetzt und erklärt von LIC. DR. CARL STEUERNAGEL, Privatdozent der Theologie in Halle a. S. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. xlii + 130. M. 3.20. (= "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," herausgegeben von Dr. W. Nowack, ord. Prof. d. Theol. in Strassburg im Elsass. I. Abtheilung: *Die historischen Bücher*, 3. Band, 1. Theil.)

IN writing this commentary on Deuteronomy, Dr. Steuernagel is upon familiar ground. His two treatises, *Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums*, 1894, and *Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes*, 1896,<sup>1</sup> have introduced him to the world of scholars, and this new work will undoubtedly serve to enhance his reputation. The commentary proper is concise, and yet sufficiently full to explain most of the points upon which the ordinary student would need light. It is an occasion for thankfulness that the space at the disposal of the author did not permit him to introduce long-drawn-out etymological discussions, nor to seek to controvert the opinions of his predecessors. The monumental work of Dillmann will not be displaced by this new book, but there can be no doubt that, with its generally lucid style, its freedom from parentheses and references to the views of other authorities, and its moderate price withal, this commentary will win for itself a place in the field of Old Testament science.

In the translation which accompanies the commentary the author has succeeded in turning the Hebrew into good idiomatic German. In his treatment of the text he adopts a large number of what seem to us uncalled-for emendations, on the authority chiefly of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Septuagint. For the difficult passage in 32:5, for which Driver could do no better than to follow Oettli and render, "Corruptly has dealt toward him — not his sons are their blemish — a twisted and crooked generation," our author reads with Samaritan and LXX, שְׁחָתוּ לֹא לֹא בְּנֵי מוֹם, and then by cutting out לֹא, which is only a variant of לֹא, he secures the very satisfactory translation: "Gefrevelt haben gegen ihn die Schändlichen, etc." The suggestion that in the obscure passage 18:8b we should read לְבַד מִכַּמְרִים עַל הָאֲבוֹת, "ausgenommen Götzenpriester samt den Totenbeschwörern," is also ingenious and worthy of mention.

Questions of geography, archæology, and biblical theology receive but slight consideration. In this respect the book is much less valuable

<sup>1</sup> See AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, April, 1897, pp. 386-9.

than Driver's commentary, and even with the limited space at his disposal our author might have made a more useful book if he had been willing to curtail his discussions of minute literary analysis and to devote more space to these important topics.

But it is perhaps unfair to criticise the book at this point, for it is plain that both commentary and introduction have been written to set forth and defend the author's views as to the origin and composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and its relation to the historical and religious development of the Jewish people.

In the long introduction<sup>2</sup> the author gives a comprehensive statement of his views and of his reasons for them, and in the commentary itself applies his principles, and sets forth the results of his analysis, by the employment of no less than eight different kinds of type in the translation. His thesis is that the deuteronomic law-book upon which the reform of Josiah was based is not a unity, but that it is the result of a process of growth extending over more than half a century. The clue to the analysis of this deuteronomic law-book, 4 : 44—30 : 20, is furnished by the use, now of the second person singular, now of the second person plural, as forms of direct address, in the introductory chaps. 5—11. On the basis of this distinction these chapters may be divided into two parts, each of which furnishes an introduction to a distinct body of laws. In the introduction which uses the second singular (Sg.), Moses is represented as prefacing his promulgation of the law by a hortatory address to the people when they were on the point of crossing the Jordan, urging them to continue faithful in their service of Jehovah. The same author also supplemented the law with an address in which blessings were promised for obedience and curses were threatened for disobedience. The introduction in which the second person plural (Pl.) is used represents Moses as telling the people how he came to be the recipient of the divine laws, and as warning them against idolatry. According to this author the address was delivered at Horeb shortly after the command to leave Horeb had been received.

Each of these introductions has its own body of laws, but while those of Sg. are comparatively homogeneous and use throughout the second person singular, those of Pl. use now the second person plural, now the second person singular, and sometimes have no formula of address. The nucleus of both of these collections is to be found in the law demanding the centralization of worship (chap. 12),

<sup>2</sup> xlii, not lxii, pages, as the transposition of x and l on the last page of the introduction makes it read.

which is probably a recapitulation of an edict of Hezekiah, whose recorded efforts to reform the cult (2 Kings 18: 4) are regarded as historical; the law with regard to the treatment of an inciter to idolatry; the law as to the court of last resort; and, finally, the law in regard to the cities of refuge. This primary collection which appears in the recensions of both Sg. and Pl. is regarded as having been composed probably at the suggestion of Hezekiah. It was taken up and worked over and largely supplemented by Sg., a writer living about 690 B. C., or at any rate in the reign of Manasseh. At about the same time this collection was united with a distinct body of laws dealing with family relations into a collection called the laws of the "elders," from the frequent mention of the city elders. These laws of the elders were taken up by Pl., an author living about 670 B. C., and united with a number of other laws, among them being certain war laws, and "abomination" oracles. Still later, probably about 650 B. C., these laws, with their introductions and conclusions, were united by a redactor of the reform party into one book. Owing to adverse circumstances it was not promulgated at the time, but was laid away in the temple and lost, to be discovered at a later date by Hilkiah and made the basis of the reforms of Josiah.

After the reform of Josiah, but before the exile, this law-book (D<sup>1</sup>) was provided with a historical narrative describing the last days and death of Moses (D<sup>2</sup>). In the course of time it was united with the Hexateuch document known as JE, and still later, in the days after the exile, this consolidated document was united with P. During these years, and especially in consequence of the union with other documents, Deuteronomy was being gradually enlarged until it assumed the form in which we now have it. Apart from the Decalogue, two of the most important independent addresses are the Song and Blessing of Moses. The Song originated in the days of Deutero-Isaiah, but was provided with an introduction, 31: 16-22, 24-30, and a conclusion, 32: 44-47, after the close of the exile, and incorporated in the book of Deuteronomy. The Blessing, 33: 1-29, consists of an introduction, vss. 2-5, a conclusion, vss. 26-29, and the blessing proper, vss. 6-25. This blessing was written in the northern kingdom in the days of Jeroboam II. After the exile, however, vss. 2-5 and 26-29, which originally formed one psalm, were separated from each other and made to serve as introduction and conclusion respectively to the blessing. In this form it was inserted probably after the time of Rp. in the book of Deuteronomy.

As a result of Steuernagel's labors, we are led to the conclusion,

therefore, that the document D or D' is not essentially a unity, as has usually been supposed, but is rather a collection of the productions of a school of reformers.

The relationship of the various documents is not considered at length in this book, as the introduction to the Hexateuch is to appear in connection with the commentary on Joshua. But the order of documents which is fast becoming traditional, viz., JE, D, P, is assumed. Our author is of the opinion that the Decalogue did not form a part of the original deuteronomic law-book, but that it is a later composition which was afterward inserted in Deuteronomy and copied from Deuteronomy in Exodus. He also holds that the "book of the Covenant," as a literary document, was unknown to D', and is inclined to believe that the resemblance between the laws of Sg. and the laws collected in Ex., chap. 34, is due to the fact that the authors of the two collections were familiar with the same customs. It cannot be determined whether Sg. used J or E or JE as the authority for his account of the wanderings, but it is insisted that both Pl. and D<sup>2</sup> knew and used E and E alone.

The concluding portion of the introduction is a valuable table of the vocabulary and peculiar idioms of the book of Deuteronomy. The author has made a list of no less than eighty-nine words which are used either alone or in connection with other words in certain set phrases. This table with its references is very full, and the attempt is made in it to classify the various usages of Sg., Pl., D<sup>2</sup>, and R. Steuernagel asserts, it is true, that he regards the linguistic argument as of only secondary value, but there is no doubt that in more than one case this argument has been the determining one in his analysis.

There is unquestionably a strong attraction about this theory which shows us the deuteronomic law growing up, as it were, under our very eyes, and if we had any external evidence that Sg. and Pl. were actual men, or that these various collections grew up as the result of the formulation of royal edicts and prophetic and priestly discussions, it might be possible to believe that later additions which are left entirely unaccounted for to the amount of between 150 and 160 verses, or about one-sixth of the whole book, were made by many unknown and irresponsible copyists. But when we have only the finished work, we must confess that we are unequal to the strain which is put upon our imagination. Furthermore, the very difficulty of making the decision between Sg. and Pl., and the not infrequent resort to the theory of interpolations to account for the presence particularly of Pl. in Sg. sections, taken together with the fact that, with the exception of the law

with regard to the centralization of worship, nearly every law which is assigned to the Pl. collection which has the formula of address at all has the address in the second person singular, do not increase our confidence in the correctness of the theory. The analysis of 17:8-13 must suffice to illustrate the violent methods which must sometimes be employed. To Pl. are assigned 8a, 9, with the exception of the reference to the Levitical priests, 11a<sup>B</sup> b, 12, omitting the reference to the priests who stand before Jehovah; to Sg. 8b, 10b. According to Sg. the court of last resort is the central sanctuary, according to Pl. it is the judge, probably the judge *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the king. As a result of the process of amalgamation and redactional glosses, two laws which seem to be mutually contradictory are united into one law, which is usually interpreted as presupposing "a supreme tribunal composed partly of Levitical priests, partly of lay judges."

But whatever may be thought of our author's theory as to the origin of the book, we gladly acknowledge that he has made a valuable contribution to the subject, and hope that he and others who shall be stimulated by his example may lead us nearer to the solution of the problem.

It only remains to add that the book is admirably printed, and, with the exception of a few slips in citations, and the dropping of the *ם* before *יִלְיִל* on p. 119, l. 8 from the bottom, is unusually free from typographical errors.

WALTER R. BETTERIDGE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,  
Rochester, N. Y.

DIE SPRÜCHE. Uebersetzt und erklärt von LIC. DR. W. FRANKENBERG. PREDIGER UND HOHESLIED. Uebersetzt und erklärt von DR. THEOL. C. SIEGFRIED. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. iv+170 and iv+126. M. 6. (= "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," herausgegeben von Dr. Theol. A. Nowack, ord. Prof. der Theol. in Strassburg im Elsass. II. Abtheilung: *Die poetischen Bücher*, 3. Band, 1. und 2. Theil.)

THE "Handkommentar" of Nowack is already favorably known, and this volume seems to maintain the standard set by the earlier issues. Pastor Frankenberg we have not met before. The present work is a good testimonial to his capability, though his subject gives less room for originality than some other parts of the Old Testament. His introduction takes the position now generally accepted, namely: that the Wisdom literature belongs altogether in the post-exilic period. More particularly (and in this he can hardly count on unanimous support)